PLATE VI.

Fig. 1. Posterior part of inferior surface of skull of Loxomma, a different specimen from that shown in Plates IV. and V. Natural size. \hat{R} , ridge on median line, fractured; P.n.o, posterior nasal orifice; B.sph, basisphenoid; B.oc, basioccipital; Ar.car, situation of articular cavity, here broken away; F.m, foramen magnum, edge of; F.exoc, facets of exoccipitals; Qu, quadrate bone;

Mast, mastoid bone; Pter, pterygoid bone.
Fig. 2. External surface right half-mandible of Loxomma, supposed to be of the same specimen as is figured in Plates IV. & V. Half natural size. The fractured part, the external end of the articular cavity, and the marginal groove along the lower

border are well shown.

Fig. 3. Internal surface of fragment of left half-mandible, showing the symphysis, the difference of level between the alveolar borders, the teeth, and the interdental depressions. Half the natural size.

Dorsal vertebra, natural size. C, centrum; N.c, neural canal; S.p, spinous process; T.p, transverse process; A.z, anterior zygomatic process; P.z, posterior zygomatic process.

PLATE VII.

Fig. 1. Rib, half the natural size.

Fig. 2. Longitudinal antero-posterior section through middle of a small tooth and its alveolar border, from right half-mandible, magnified four diameters. A, alveolus; E, enamel; D, dentine; P, pulp-

Fig. 3. Transverse section near apex of tooth, as indicated in fig. 2, sect. 3. Magnified 16 diameters. E, enamel; D, dentine;

P, pulp-cavity.

Fig. 4. Transverse section just above the cessation of the plice, magnified 16 diameters. See fig. 2, sect. 4. E, enamel; D, dentine; P, pulp-cavity.

Fig. 5. Transverse section immediately below alveolar border, fig. 2, sect. 5. Magnified 16 diameters. D, dentine; P, pulp-cavity; p, radiations from pulp-cavity; t, toothlets; B, bone.

Fig. 6. Portion of fig. 5, to show minute structure. Magnified about 48 diameters. B, bone; ex.l, external layer of dentine; gr.l, granular layer; D, dentine, tubular; pl, plicæ, long and short; ex.in, external layer infolded; gr.in, granular layer infolded.

X .- On a new Genus and Species of Bird belonging to the Family Nectariniidæ. By R. Bowdler Sharpe, F.L.S., F.Z.S., &c., Senior Assistant, Zoological Department, British Museum.

Dr. Alexander Smith has very kindly presented to the Museum some birds received by him from Old Calabar; and amongst other interesting species is one which appears to be the type of a new and undescribed genus. I therefore propose to call it

Lobornis, gen. nov.

The characteristics may be thus, shortly, described. Very close to Pholidornis, and of the same diminutive size, but without the peculiarly pronounced scaly appearance of that genus, from which it is, moreover, at once distinguishable by the lobes near the gape. When the bird was first taken out of spirit these lobes were very distinct, three in number, and pure white; they have almost disappeared since the bird was skinned.

The type of this new genus I call

Lobornis Alexandri, sp. n.

General colour of upper surface umber-brown, the feathers of the head slightly scale-like in character; the upper tail-coverts rather more rufous brown, with which colour the wing-coverts and quills are margined; tail dull brown; entire under surface light brown, the throat and fore neck strongly tinged with rufous, as also are the flanks; the breast and under tail-coverts very slightly varied with wavy cross bars of dark brown; under wing-coverts light brown, slightly varied with obscure cross bars of darker brown; bill horn-brown, yellowish at base; feet very pale brown. Total length 3·8 inches, culmen 0·3, wing 1·65, tail 1·1, tarsus 0·6.

Hab. Old Calabar.

I name this bird after Dr. Alexander Smith, to whom the Museum has often been indebted for additions to its collection.

XI.—On Priority in the Discovery of the Canal-System in Foraminifera. By Messrs. Parker, Jones, and Brady.

To the Editors of the Annals and Magazine of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

There is one paragraph in our friend Mr. Carter's paper, "On the Structure called *Eozoon canadense* in the Laurentian Limestone of Canada," in the May number of the 'Annals,' which can hardly be allowed to pass without comment; for, as it at present stands (from some oversight, doubtless, on the part of the writer), it does serious injustice to two other observers. Our attention has been called to the passage, with the suggestion that perhaps its correction would come better from unbiased lookers on, friends alike of all concerned, than from those more immediately and personally interested.

The question has nothing to do with the *Eozoon* controversy, but is simply one of priority in discovery, apparently claimed